Event-by-event v_2 correlations of soft hadrons and heavy mesons in heavy ion collisions

Caio A. G. Prado,[1] Jacquelyn Noronha-Hostler,[2] Alexandre A. P. Suaide,[1]
Jorge Noronha,[1] Marcelo G. Munhoz,[1] and Mauro R. Cosentino[3]

[1] *Instituto de Física, Universidade de São Paulo, C.P. 66318, 05315-970 São Paulo, SP, Brazil*
[2] *Department of Physics, University of Houston, Houston TX 77204, USA*
[3] *Centro de Ciências Naturais e Humanas, Universidade Federal do ABC, Av. dos Estados 5001, Bairro Santa Terezina, 09210-508 Santo André, SP, Brazil*

(Dated: November 10, 2016)

In this paper heavy quark energy loss models are embedded in full event-by-event viscous hydrodynamic simulations to investigate the nuclear suppression factor and flow harmonics of heavy flavor mesons in PbPb collisions at 2.76 TeV in the p_T range 8–30 GeV. In our model calculations, the $R_{\rm AA}$ of $\rm D^0$ and $\rm B^0$ mesons are nearly identical and this approximate flavor independence is carried over to the flow harmonics. We present the first calculations of the heavy flavor flow cumulants $v_2\{2\}$ and $v_3\{2\}$ (and also discuss $v_2\{4\}$), which indicate that bottom quarks can flow as much as charm quarks at high p_T. Event-shape engineering techniques are used to compute the event-by-event correlation between the soft hadron v_2 and the heavy meson v_2. We predict a linear correlation between these observables on an event-by-event basis.

arXiv:1611.02965v1 [nucl-th] 9 Nov 2016

During the last decade, remarkable progress has been made towards understanding the properties of the strongly interacting Quark-Gluon Plasma (QGP) produced in ultrarelativistic heavy ion collisions [1, 2]. A defining feature of the QGP formed in these reactions is its ability to flow as a nearly perfect liquid in which the shear viscosity to entropy density ratio $\eta/s \sim 0.1$ is an order of magnitude smaller than that found in ordinary fluids such as water [3].

Event-by-event relativistic viscous hydrodynamic simulations (for a review, see [4]) have revealed that in this QCD liquid, viscous effects are so small that the spatial inhomogeneities present in the initial state are efficiently converted into final state momentum space anisotropy [5, 6]. In fact, one finds that the low p_T elliptic and triangular flows of all charged particles, v_2 and v_3, are linearly correlated with the corresponding eccentricities of the initial state, ε_2 and ε_3 [7–10], while higher order flow harmonics exhibit some degree of nonlinear response [11–14].

In contrast, the underlying physical mechanism responsible for azimuthal anisotropies at high $p_T \gtrsim 10$ GeV relies not on pressure and local flow gradients but rather on differences in the path length experienced by highly energetic probes quenched by the expanding medium [15, 16]. This qualitative understanding has been recently confirmed by the first jet energy loss + event-by-event viscous hydrodynamic calculations performed in [17, 18], which can simultaneously describe experimental data for the nuclear modification factor $R_{\rm AA}$, v_2, and v_3 of all charged particles at high p_T. A novel feature found in these works [17, 18] is that the approximate linear response between v_2 and ε_2 also holds at high p_T on an event-by-event basis. This implies that the quantum randomness in the position of the nucleons in the incident nuclei, which determines the fluctuations of the initial conditions used in the subsequent hydrodynamic evolution, significantly affects the distribution of path lengths traversed by jets in the medium.

The recent observation of large azimuthal anisotropy displayed by open heavy flavor mesons [19–21] adds important new elements to the overall picture discussed above. Heavy quarks are produced by hard processes in the initial stages of the collision with a non-thermal transverse momentum spectrum, which is expected to relax towards a nearly thermal distribution within a relaxation time scale $\sim \frac{M}{T}\frac{\eta}{sT}$ [22] (where M is the heavy quark mass). Thus, the difference between the charm and bottom quark masses suggests that at low p_T the $\rm D^0$ meson v_2 and v_3 should be larger than the corresponding coefficients for $\rm B^0$ mesons (see [23] for an early study). Additionally, at low p_T quark coalescence [24–26] between heavy and light flavors [27, 28] can substantially increase the elliptic flow of heavy mesons [29, 30].

At large transverse momenta, i.e, $p_T \gtrsim 10$ GeV, heavy quarks hadronize mostly via fragmentation and this provides a simpler scenario for studying how initial state spatial anisotropies are mapped into the final state heavy flavor flow harmonics. In this paper we address this problem by exploring new techniques that can provide a bridge between soft physics and heavy flavor jet quenching observables. Here a heavy quark energy loss model is embedded on top of event-by-event viscous hydrodynamic backgrounds to study the nuclear suppression factor and flow harmonics of heavy flavor mesons in PbPb collisions at 2.76 TeV in the transverse momentum range 8–30 GeV. In our calculations, the $R_{\rm AA}$'s of $\rm D^0$ and $\rm B^0$ mesons are found to be nearly the same and this behavior persists as well in the flow harmonics. This is explicitly shown by the calculations of $v_2\{2\}$, $v_2\{4\}$, and $v_3\{2\}$ of $\rm D^0$ and $\rm B^0$ mesons presented here. Our event-by-event approach predicts a linear correlation between the soft hadron and the heavy meson elliptic flows, which could be verified experimentally at LHC.

To simulate the propagation of heavy quark jets in the medium, we developed a modular Monte Carlo code in C++, combined with ROOT [31] and PYTHIA8 [32] libraries, that allows for a variety of energy loss models to be implemented. Starting from the initial conditions, we sample heavy probes (bottom and charm quarks) inside the medium with initial momentum distribution given by pQCD FONLL calculations [33, 34]. We currently neglect any effects of the jet probes on the evolving medium [35] though the local spacetime dependence of the hydrodynamic fields is considered in the calculations for the energy loss.

Given that energy loss formulas based on a parametric model [36] can give a good description of high p_T flow harmonics [17, 18], for this first study we employ the following simple parametrization for the heavy quark energy loss per unit length

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}E}{\mathrm{d}x}(T,v) = f(T,v)\,\Gamma_{\mathrm{flow}}, \tag{1}$$

where T is the medium temperature experienced by the quark along its trajectory, v is the heavy quark velocity, $\Gamma_{\mathrm{flow}} = \gamma\left[1 - v\cos(\varphi_{\mathrm{quark}} - \varphi_{\mathrm{flow}})\right]$ (with $\gamma = 1/\sqrt{1-v^2}$) takes into account the boost from the local rest frame of the fluid [37], φ_{quark} is the angle defined by the propagating jet in the transverse plane, and φ_{flow} is the local azimuthal angle of the underlying flow. The jet propagation starts from a production point $\vec{x}_0$ perpendicular to the beam axis and moves in the transverse plane along the direction defined by φ_{quark}.

In this work we assume that the function f above can take the following forms: $f(T,v) = \xi T^2$ and $f(T,v) = \alpha$, with ξ and α being constants for each quark flavor. Both forms are simplified approximations for the interactions between heavy quarks and the strongly interacting QGP liquid. The first choice is inspired by conformal AdS/CFT calculations [38] (see, for instance, [39] for the case of a non-conformal plasma). The second choice, in which the energy loss is temperature independent, was inspired by the study performed in [40] which showed that a non-decreasing drag coefficient near the phase transition is favored for a simultaneous description of heavy flavor $R_{\mathrm{AA}}(p_T)$ and $v_2(p_T)$ (this picture is supported, for instance, by T-matrix calculations [41, 42]). The way the free constants in the energy loss models are fixed for each flavor is discussed later in this paper.

Our heavy flavor calculations require the use of hydrodynamical profiles to provide the temperature and flow fields at each time step for each event. We generate hydrodynamic profiles using the 2+1 event-by-event relativistic viscous hydrodynamical model, v-USPhydro [43–45], whose accuracy has been checked using analytical viscous hydrodynamic tests [46]. Our hydrodynamic setup is identical to that used in [17, 45] (MCKLN initial conditions at PbPb $\sqrt{s} = 2.76$ TeV [47–49], $\eta/s = 0.11$, and initial time τ_0=0.6 fm), which was shown to match experimental data well in the soft sector. The heavy quarks are evolved on top of hydrodynamic backgrounds until they reach the jet-medium decoupling temperature T_d below which hadronization, via the Peterson fragmentation function [50], is performed. In our model, this parameter encodes the large uncertainties regarding hadronization of jets in the QGP. The obtained mesons are further decayed into electrons using PYTHIA8. Currently, coalescence is not taken into account but it will be implemented in future work to extend the validity of our calculations to the low p_T regime.

In this work, an event-by-event analysis is possible by oversampling each individual hydro event with millions of heavy quarks. Thus, from each individual event the nuclear modification factor $R^Q_{\mathrm{AA}}(p_T,\varphi)$ for charm and bottom quarks ($Q = c, b$) is obtained and the corresponding flow harmonics

$$v^Q_n(p_T) = \frac{\frac{1}{2\pi}\int_0^{2\pi}\mathrm{d}\phi\,\cos\left[n\phi - n\psi^Q_n(p_T)\right]\,R^Q_{\mathrm{AA}}(p_T,\phi)}{R^Q_{\mathrm{AA}}(p_T)}, \tag{2}$$

are calculated based on [51] with

$$\psi^Q_n(p_T) = \frac{1}{n}\tan^{-1}\left(\frac{\int_0^{2\pi}\mathrm{d}\phi\,\sin(n\phi)\,R^Q_{\mathrm{AA}}(p_T,\phi)}{\int_0^{2\pi}\mathrm{d}\phi\,\cos(n\phi)\,R^Q_{\mathrm{AA}}(p_T,\phi)}\right). \tag{3}$$

In reality, there are very few heavy quarks per event and our approach can be understood to give the probability for an event with a certain v_n and ψ_n in the soft sector to produce the heavy flavor quantities $v^Q_n(p_T)$ and $\psi^Q_n(p_T)$. In order to compare to experimental data the scalar product method [52, 53] is used to calculate the 2 and 4-particle cumulants with the inclusion of multiplicity weighting and centrality class rebinning as described in [18, 54]. We have at least a couple of thousand hydrodynamic events in each centrality class and we checked that our statistical error bars (computed using jackknife resampling [55]) are on the order of 10^{-4}.

The free parameters ξ and α that define the two charm energy loss scenarios in (1) are determined by matching our model calculations for D^0 R_{AA} to experimental data at p_T around 10 GeV in the 0–10% centrality class. The same procedure has been used to fix the jet-medium coupling in the light sector in [17, 18, 36]. Since both bottom and charm contribute to the electron spectrum, we find the value for the corresponding constants in the bottom energy loss scenarios by matching the calculations of non-photonic electron R_{AA} with the data also at p_T around 10 GeV and 0–10% centrality, using the FONLL spectra for electron production from a given quark. With both of these values fixed[1] we can perform a full simulation across all p_T and centralities.

[1] We used $\xi_c = (18, 23)$, $\xi_b = (21.25, 25.50)$, $\alpha_c = (0.6, 1)$ GeV^2,

Fig. 1 shows our results for D^0 meson and heavy flavor electron R_{AA}, together with run 1 LHC experimental data [56–59], and also predictions for the R_{AA} of B^0 mesons. In this plot, we use $\frac{dE}{dx} \sim \alpha$ and decoupling temperature $T_d = 120$ MeV. We find that D^0 and B^0 meson R_{AA}'s are roughly equivalent in the p_T range 10–40 GeV and this result is robust with respect to variations in T_d and in energy loss model assumptions.



FIG. 1. (Color online) R_{AA} for D^0 meson (upper panel) and heavy flavor electron (lower panel) for $\frac{dE}{dx} \sim \alpha$ and $T_d = 120$ MeV compared to experimental data [56–59].

Including the necessary details regarding multiplicity weighting and centrality class rebinning [17, 18], we compute the differential $v_2\{2\}$ for D^0 meson at 30–50% centrality and compare it to experimental data in the upper panel of Fig. 2. Also, a comparison between our calculations and electron data at 20–40% centrality is shown in the lower panel of Fig. 2. Our model is consistent with the data at high p_T, though it falls below the data at low p_T where coalescence effects are relevant. One can find our prediction for the B^0 meson $v_2\{2\}$ at $\sqrt{s} = 2.76$ TeV in the 30–50% centrality class in the middle panel of Fig. 2. In our calculations, there is no appreciable difference between the elliptic flow of D^0 and B^0 mesons. The energy loss scenario where $\frac{dE}{dx} \sim \alpha$ gives the largest $v_2\{2\}$ (as it occurred for the smooth initial condition simulation used in [40]) while the bands illustrate the dependence of these observables with the jet-decoupling temperature parameter. We find that the flow harmonics increase when T_d is lowered from 160 to 120 MeV, which is expected due to the larger time available to build up flow.

Our predictions for the corresponding $v_3\{2\}$ of D^0 and B^0 mesons can be found in Fig. 3. No significant difference is found between the triangular flow of D^0 and B^0 mesons, though their $v_3\{2\}$ is nearly an order of magnitude smaller than their correspondent $v_2\{2\}$ shown in Fig. 2. By considering event-by-event simulations, we can now show that the non-decreasing drag coefficient scenario discussed in [40] gives not only the largest $v_2\{2\}$ but



FIG. 2. (Color online) $v_2\{2\}$ for D^0 meson (upper panel), B^0 meson (middle), and electron from heavy flavor (lower panel) for two energy loss models. The bands represent the variation of the T_d range 120–160 MeV. Data from the ALICE experiment [19–21].



FIG. 3. (Color online) $v_3\{2\}$ for D^0 meson (upper panel) and B^0 meson (lower panel) for two energy loss models. The bands represent the variation of the T_d range 120–160 MeV.

and $\alpha_b = (0.68, 0.98)$ GeV^2 where the first term in the parenthesis represents $T_d = 120$ MeV while for the second $T_d = 160$ MeV.

also the largest $v_3\{2\}$, thereby amplifying the survival of the initial state fluctuations perceived by heavy flavors throughout the evolution. Also, we note that $v_3\{2\}$ is particularly sensitive to the decoupling between heavy quarks and the medium. We seem to find a smaller triangular flow for D^0 mesons than Refs. [29, 60], which is likely due to the event-plane decorrelation effect present at high p_T [17, 18, 61]. Our calculations in Figs. 1-3 show that, at high p_T, the (small) difference in these observables due to the choice of energy loss model is overwhelmed by the (currently large) experimental error bars and uncertainties in T_d.

Flow harmonic fluctuations can be systematically investigated using multi-particle cumulants [62, 63] which, in the present context of heavy-light flavor flow correlations, should give valuable information about the spectrum of path length fluctuations of heavy quark jets in the medium. However, it is not clear at the moment whether the current statistics allows for the proper measurement of higher order heavy flavor cumulants at high p_T at LHC (or even $v_3\{2\}$ with small enough error bars). Because we oversample each event, in our theoretical calculations we have enough statistics to compute multi-particle cumulants such as $v_2\{4\}$ which measures the correlation between a heavy flavor candidate and 3 soft particles (4-particle cumulants were computed at high p_T already in [18]). For the 30–50% centrality class and p_T range 8–30 GeV we find that $v_2\{4\}/v_2\{2\} \sim 0.95$ within statistical error bars regardless of variations in the energy loss, T_d, and quark flavor. A similar value, in the case of light flavor jets, was reported in [18]. A more detailed study, involving the centrality dependence of $v_2\{4\}/v_2\{2\}$ and also the calculation of even higher order cumulants (such as $v_2\{6\}$ and $v_2\{8\}$) in the heavy flavor sector will be presented elsewhere.

We now propose a new observable that encodes the event-by-event fluctuations of heavy flavor elliptic flow at high p_T that does not require the challenging high statistics needed in multi-particle cumulants analyses. For a given hydrodynamic event characterized by a certain value of the soft hadron $v_2\{2\}$, we can calculate the corresponding elliptic flow for B^0 and D^0 mesons in each event (this would be akin to the probability that a certain soft event corresponds to this particular heavy flavor v_2), which is shown in the scatter plot in Fig. 4. This plot shows that the soft and the heavy elliptic flow are correlated event-by-event within a given centrality class. Experimentally, one can bin the soft $v_2\{2\}$ and calculate the corresponding heavy meson v_2 for those set of events, as was done for high p_T identified hadrons by the ATLAS collaboration in [64]. This type of event-shape engineering procedure [65] gives rise to the solid black lines in Fig. 4. If there were no v_2 fluctuations in the heavy flavor sector one would see a flat, horizontal line. Rather, our calculations predict a clear linear correlation between the heavy meson v_2 and the elliptic flow of all charged



FIG. 4. (Color online) Event-by-event correlation between the D^0 v_2 (upper panels) in the p_T range 8–13 GeV and the soft hadron v_2 for two energy loss models. A similar analysis for the B^0 meson is shown in the lower panels. The solid lines stem from binning the heavy meson result by the soft hadron v_2.



FIG. 5. (Color online) Correlation between $v_2^{(heavy)}\{2\}$ for p_T in 8–13 GeV and $v_2^{(soft)}$ for D^0 meson (upper panel) and B^0 meson (lower panel) using our two energy loss models. The bands represent the variation of the T_d range 120–160 MeV.

hadrons.

This correlation is investigated in detail in Fig. 5 where we binned soft vs. heavy v_2 and varied the energy loss model as well as the jet-decoupling parameter. One can see that the correlation between soft hadrons and heavy mesons has good potential to distinguish between energy loss models even after taking into account the T_d hadronization uncertainty band. Moreover, we find no significant difference between the correlation of charm and bottom meson v_2 with the soft hadron elliptic flow. These results indicate that novel event-shape engineering techniques involving the flow of soft hadrons and heavy

flavor will be instrumental in determining the collective behavior of heavy quarks in the QGP. A detailed analysis of the results discussed in this letter, and their extension to PbPb collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 5.02$ TeV, will be presented elsewhere.

In summary we presented the first theoretical calculations of D^0 and B^0 meson multi-particle flow cumulants in heavy ion collisions performed using realistic event-by-event viscous hydrodynamics. Our calculations describe the published $R_{\rm AA}$ and v_2 PbPb run 1 LHC data for D^0 and heavy flavor electrons in transverse momentum range 8–30 GeV and predictions for the $v_2\{2\}$ and $v_3\{2\}$ of B^0 mesons were given. Our calculations predict that the $v_2\{2\}$ of D^0 and B^0 mesons are nearly the same in this range of transverse momentum (the same holds for $v_3\{2\}$), which could be verified experimentally in the near future. We computed for the first time the heavy flavor 4-particle cumulant $v_2\{4\}$, which paves the way for experimental and theoretical studies of elliptic flow fluctuations of heavy flavor.

One of the main questions in the field regarding heavy quarks concerns the extent with which they couple and, consequently, flow with the expanding QGP formed in heavy ion collisions. Our calculations show that soft-heavy event-by-event v_2 correlations can capture differences between energy loss models that are otherwise indistinguishable in R_{AA} and $v_{2,3}\{2\}$ given the current experimental and theoretical uncertainties. The linear correlation predicted here between the D^0 (and B^0) meson v_2 and the underlying soft hadron v_2 provides a novel, much more stringent signature of collectivity in the heavy flavor sector that is valid on an event-by-event basis. An experimental confirmation of this behavior requires extending the current cutting edge event-shape engineering techniques [64, 66] to consider soft-heavy correlations, which should be feasible especially during the LHC run 2. This would not only quantify how much heavy quarks flow in comparison to light flavors on an event-by-event basis, but also give new insight into how the ubiquitous quantum mechanical fluctuations present in the initial state affect the energy loss experienced by heavy quarks in the plasma.

The authors thank Fundação de Amparo à Pesquisa do Estado de São Paulo (FAPESP) and Conselho Nacional de Desenvolvimento Científico e Tecnológico (CNPq) for support. J.N.H. was supported by the National Science Foundation under grant no. PHY-1513864 and she acknowledges the use of the Maxwell Cluster and the advanced support from the Center of Advanced Computing and Data Systems at the University of Houston to carry out the research presented here. J.N. thanks the University of Houston for its hospitality.

[1] M. Gyulassy and L. McLerran, *Quark gluon plasma. New discoveries at RHIC: A case of strongly interacting quark gluon plasma. Proceedings, RBRC Workshop, Brookhaven, Upton, USA, May 14-15, 2004*, Nucl. Phys. **A750**, 30 (2005), arXiv:nucl-th/0405013 [nucl-th].

[2] E. V. Shuryak, *Quark gluon plasma. New discoveries at RHIC: A case of strongly interacting quark gluon plasma. Proceedings, RBRC Workshop, Brookhaven, Upton, USA, May 14-15, 2004*, Nucl. Phys. **A750**, 64 (2005), arXiv:hep-ph/0405066 [hep-ph].

[3] L. P. Csernai, J. Kapusta, and L. D. McLerran, Phys. Rev. Lett. **97**, 152303 (2006), arXiv:nucl-th/0604032 [nucl-th].

[4] U. Heinz and R. Snellings, Ann. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci. **63**, 123 (2013), arXiv:1301.2826 [nucl-th].

[5] J. Takahashi, B. M. Tavares, W. L. Qian, R. Andrade, F. Grassi, Y. Hama, T. Kodama, and N. Xu, Phys. Rev. Lett. **103**, 242301 (2009), arXiv:0902.4870 [nucl-th].

[6] B. Alver and G. Roland, Phys. Rev. **C81**, 054905 (2010), [Erratum: Phys. Rev.C82,039903(2010)], arXiv:1003.0194 [nucl-th].

[7] D. Teaney and L. Yan, Phys. Rev. **C83**, 064904 (2011), arXiv:1010.1876 [nucl-th].

[8] F. G. Gardim, F. Grassi, M. Luzum, and J.-Y. Ollitrault, Phys. Rev. **C85**, 024908 (2012), arXiv:1111.6538 [nucl-th].

[9] H. Niemi, G. S. Denicol, H. Holopainen, and P. Huovinen, Phys. Rev. **C87**, 054901 (2013), arXiv:1212.1008 [nucl-th].

[10] F. G. Gardim, J. Noronha-Hostler, M. Luzum, and F. Grassi, Phys. Rev. **C91**, 034902 (2015), arXiv:1411.2574 [nucl-th].

[11] D. Teaney and L. Yan, Phys. Rev. **C86**, 044908 (2012), arXiv:1206.1905 [nucl-th].

[12] H. Niemi, K. J. Eskola, and R. Paatelainen, Phys. Rev. **C93**, 024907 (2016), arXiv:1505.02677 [hep-ph].

[13] J. Noronha-Hostler, L. Yan, F. G. Gardim, and J.-Y. Ollitrault, Phys. Rev. **C93**, 014909 (2016), arXiv:1511.03896 [nucl-th].

[14] J. Qian and U. Heinz, Phys. Rev. **C94**, 024910 (2016), arXiv:1607.01732 [nucl-th].

[15] X.-N. Wang, Phys. Rev. **C63**, 054902 (2001), arXiv:nucl-th/0009019 [nucl-th].

[16] M. Gyulassy, I. Vitev, and X. N. Wang, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 2537 (2001), arXiv:nucl-th/0012092 [nucl-th].

[17] J. Noronha-Hostler, B. Betz, J. Noronha, and M. Gyulassy, Phys. Rev. Lett. **116**, 252301 (2016), arXiv:1602.03788 [nucl-th].

[18] B. Betz, M. Gyulassy, M. Luzum, J. Noronha, J. Noronha-Hostler, I. Portillo, and C. Ratti, (2016), arXiv:1609.05171 [nucl-th].

[19] B. Abelev *et al.* (ALICE), Phys. Rev. Lett. **111**, 102301 (2013), arXiv:1305.2707 [nucl-ex].

[20] B. B. Abelev *et al.* (ALICE), Phys. Rev. **C90**, 034904 (2014),

arXiv:1405.2001 [nucl-ex].
[21] J. Adam *et al.* (ALICE), JHEP **09**, 028 (2016), arXiv:1606.00321 [nucl-ex].
[22] G. D. Moore and D. Teaney, Phys. Rev. **C71**, 064904 (2005), arXiv:hep-ph/0412346 [hep-ph].
[23] M. Nahrgang, J. Aichelin, P. B. Gossiaux, and K. Werner, *Proceedings, 15th International Conference on Strangeness in Quark Matter (SQM 2015): Dubna, Moscow region, Russia, July 6-11, 2015*, J. Phys. Conf. Ser. **668**, 012024 (2016).
[24] V. Greco, C. M. Ko, and P. Levai, Phys. Rev. Lett. **90**, 202302 (2003), arXiv:nucl-th/0301093 [nucl-th].
[25] V. Greco, C. M. Ko, and P. Levai, Phys. Rev. **C68**, 034904 (2003), arXiv:nucl-th/0305024 [nucl-th].
[26] R. J. Fries, B. Muller, C. Nonaka, and S. A. Bass, Phys. Rev. Lett. **90**, 202303 (2003), arXiv:nucl-th/0301087 [nucl-th].
[27] V. Greco, C. M. Ko, and R. Rapp, Phys. Lett. **B595**, 202 (2004), arXiv:nucl-th/0312100 [nucl-th].
[28] Y. Oh, C. M. Ko, S. H. Lee, and S. Yasui, Phys. Rev. **C79**, 044905 (2009), arXiv:0901.1382 [nucl-th].
[29] M. Nahrgang, J. Aichelin, S. Bass, P. B. Gossiaux, and K. Werner, Phys. Rev. **C91**, 014904 (2015), arXiv:1410.5396 [hep-ph].
[30] S. Cao, T. Luo, G.-Y. Qin, and X.-N. Wang, Phys. Rev. **C94**, 014909 (2016), arXiv:1605.06447 [nucl-th].
[31] R. Brun and F. Rademakers, *New computing techniques in physics research V. Proceedings, 5th International Workshop, AIHENP '96, Lausanne, Switzerland, September 2-6, 1996*, Nucl. Instrum. Meth. **A389**, 81 (1997).
[32] T. Sjostrand, S. Mrenna, and P. Z. Skands, Comput. Phys. Commun. **178**, 852 (2008), arXiv:0710.3820 [hep-ph].
[33] M. Cacciari, M. Greco, and P. Nason, JHEP **05**, 007 (1998), arXiv:hep-ph/9803400 [hep-ph].
[34] M. Cacciari, S. Frixione, and P. Nason, JHEP **03**, 006 (2001), arXiv:hep-ph/0102134 [hep-ph].
[35] R. P. G. Andrade, J. Noronha, and G. S. Denicol, Phys. Rev. **C90**, 024914 (2014), arXiv:1403.1789 [nucl-th].
[36] B. Betz and M. Gyulassy, JHEP **08**, 090 (2014), [Erratum: JHEP10,043(2014)], arXiv:1404.6378 [hep-ph].
[37] R. Baier, A. H. Mueller, and D. Schiff, Phys. Lett. **B649**, 147 (2007), arXiv:nucl-th/0612068 [nucl-th].
[38] S. S. Gubser, Phys. Rev. **D74**, 126005 (2006), arXiv:hep-th/0605182 [hep-th].
[39] R. Rougemont, A. Ficnar, S. Finazzo, and J. Noronha, JHEP **04**, 102 (2016), arXiv:1507.06556 [hep-th].
[40] S. K. Das, F. Scardina, S. Plumari, and V. Greco, Phys. Lett. **B747**, 260 (2015), arXiv:1502.03757 [nucl-th].
[41] H. van Hees, M. Mannarelli, V. Greco, and R. Rapp, Phys. Rev. Lett. **100**, 192301 (2008), arXiv:0709.2884 [hep-ph].
[42] F. Riek and R. Rapp, Phys. Rev. **C82**, 035201 (2010), arXiv:1005.0769 [hep-ph].
[43] J. Noronha-Hostler, G. S. Denicol, J. Noronha, R. P. G. Andrade, and F. Grassi, Phys. Rev. **C88**, 044916 (2013), arXiv:1305.1981 [nucl-th].
[44] J. Noronha-Hostler, J. Noronha, and F. Grassi, Phys. Rev. **C90**, 034907 (2014), arXiv:1406.3333 [nucl-th].
[45] J. Noronha-Hostler, J. Noronha, and M. Gyulassy, Phys. Rev. **C93**, 024909 (2016), arXiv:1508.02455 [nucl-th].
[46] H. Marrochio, J. Noronha, G. S. Denicol, M. Luzum, S. Jeon, and C. Gale, Phys. Rev. **C91**, 014903 (2015), arXiv:1307.6130 [nucl-th].
[47] H.-J. Drescher, A. Dumitru, A. Hayashigaki, and Y. Nara, Phys. Rev. **C74**, 044905 (2006), arXiv:nucl-th/0605012 [nucl-th].
[48] H.-J. Drescher and Y. Nara, Phys. Rev. **C76**, 041903 (2007), arXiv:0707.0249 [nucl-th].
[49] H. J. Drescher and Y. Nara, Phys. Rev. **C75**, 034905 (2007), arXiv:nucl-th/0611017 [nucl-th].
[50] C. Peterson, D. Schlatter, I. Schmitt, and P. M. Zerwas, Phys. Rev. **D27**, 105 (1983).
[51] A. M. Poskanzer and S. A. Voloshin, Phys. Rev. **C58**, 1671 (1998), arXiv:nucl-ex/9805001 [nucl-ex].
[52] M. Luzum and J.-Y. Ollitrault, Phys. Rev. **C87**, 044907 (2013), arXiv:1209.2323 [nucl-ex].
[53] M. Luzum and H. Petersen, J. Phys. **G41**, 063102 (2014), arXiv:1312.5503 [nucl-th].
[54] F. G. Gardim, F. Grassi, M. Luzum, and J. Noronha-Hostler, (2016), arXiv:1608.02982 [nucl-th].
[55] R. G. Miller, Biometrika **61**, 1 (1974).
[56] B. Abelev *et al.* (ALICE), JHEP **09**, 112 (2012), arXiv:1203.2160 [nucl-ex].
[57] J. Adam *et al.* (ALICE), JHEP **03**, 081 (2016), arXiv:1509.06888 [nucl-ex].
[58] C. Collaboration (CMS), (2015).
[59] D. Moreira de Godoy (ALICE), *Proceedings, 36th Brazilian Workshop on Nuclear Physics: Maresias, Sao Paulo, Brazil, September 1-5, 2013*, AIP Conf. Proc. **1625**, 226 (2014).
[60] M. Nahrgang, J. Aichelin, P. B. Gossiaux, and K. Werner, Phys. Rev. **C93**, 044909 (2016), arXiv:1602.03544 [nucl-th].
[61] J. Jia, Phys. Rev. **C87**, 061901 (2013), arXiv:1203.3265 [nucl-th].
[62] A. Bilandzic, R. Snellings, and S. Voloshin, Phys. Rev. **C83**, 044913 (2011), arXiv:1010.0233 [nucl-ex].
[63] A. Bilandzic, C. H. Christensen, K. Gulbrandsen, A. Hansen, and Y. Zhou, Phys. Rev. **C89**, 064904 (2014), arXiv:1312.3572 [nucl-ex].
[64] G. Aad *et al.* (ATLAS), Phys. Rev. **C92**, 034903 (2015), arXiv:1504.01289 [hep-ex].
[65] J. Schukraft, A. Timmins, and S. A. Voloshin, Phys. Lett. **B719**, 394 (2013), arXiv:1208.4563 [nucl-ex].
[66] J. Adam *et al.* (ALICE), Phys. Rev. **C93**, 034916 (2016), arXiv:1507.06194 [nucl-ex].